



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,738	09/30/2003	Tony T. Quach	66329/31274	6724
23380 7590 04/28/2008 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP 1150 HUNTINGTON BUILDING 925 EUCLID AVENUE CLEVELAND, OH 44115-1414				
EXAMINER HANG, VU B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/28/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@tuckerellis.com
mary.erne@tuckerellis.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,738

Applicant(s)

QUACH ET AL.

Examiner

Vu B. Hang

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 13-16, 18-20 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 13-16, 18-20 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/30/2003.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- This office action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination filed on 03/12/2008.
- The amendments received on 03/12/2008 have been entered and made of record.
- Claims 1-5, 13-16, 18-20 and 28-30 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/12/2008 has been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments filed on 03/12/2008, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejections of Claims 1, 13, 16 and 38, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Upon further consideration, new grounds of rejections are being made in view of Salgado et al. (US Pub. 2003/0038958 A1) and Tai (US Patent 5,606,649).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salgado et al. (US Pub. 2003/0038958 A1) and Tai (US Patent 5,606,649).
5. Regarding **Claims 1 and 16**, Salgado discloses a method to manage multiple format fonts in an image generating device (see Fig.2 and paragraph [0006]), comprising the steps of: receiving a management request from an associated user to store a font in a selected storage area of the image generating device (see Fig.2 (110,114,122), paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0017]); receiving font data corresponding to a received management request (see Fig.2 (110,114,122) and paragraph [0011]); determining, from the received font data, the type of font to be stored (see Fig.2 (110,114,122), paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0016]); selectively generating a new font file (see Fig.2 (110,114,122) and paragraphs [0016-0017]); and storing the generated font file in an associated data storage for rendering of associated electronic document data (see Fig.2 (122), paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0017]). Salgado fails to expressly disclose selectively generating the font file such that when the font to be stored is of specific font, pre-appending a selected language code to the specific font data to create a new font file inclusive of a language code portion and a font data portion containing the received font data in its native form; converting font data into a suitable format for processing; receiving a document imaging request corresponding to an electronic document stored in the spooler; testing the font specification data in accordance with the font file stored in the associated data storage; and commencing the rendering operation of the electronic documents data in the spooler in conjunction with the retrieve font data file.
6. Salgado, however, teaches that printers are designed to process certain font types or formats, depending on the page description language used by the printer (see paragraph [0004])

and paragraph [0011]). Salgado further teaches obtaining information relating to the font type supported by a specific printer (see paragraph [0004] and paragraph [0014]), and storing the font code on a computer, server or at the printer (see Fig.1 (12) and paragraph [0011]). Salgado also teaches using the computer or print server to determine whether a specific printer accepts a certain font type and then converts the fonts for printing (see Fig.2 (112), paragraph [0012] and paragraph [0015]). Tai teaches a document encoding method for printing, wherein a PCL, ESCP or PostScript page description language is included with a font file for encoding font-related information to a document to be printed (see Col.5, Line 7-17 and Col.5, Line 36-41).

7. Salgado and Tai are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely font processing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include to Salgado's method the step of pre-appending a selected language code to the specific font data to create a new font file inclusive of a language code portion and a font data portion containing the received font data in its native form; and converting font data into a suitable format for processing. The motivation would be to ensure that the specified font data will be processed at a printer that supports a specific page description language. The appended page description code would enable for the specified font file to be stored at a location, and later be sent and processed at different printers that are supported by different page description languages. With this method, the original font files could be reused for printing at different printing locations that are supported by various page description languages. It is also obvious that the print server and the print driver would test the specified font information in accordance with the font file stored, and commence the rendering operation of the electronic documents data in the spooler in conjunction with the retrieve font data file. Without testing the

Art Unit: 2625

specified font data and rendering the electronic documents data in the spooler in conjunction with the retrieve font data file, the print data cannot be processed and printed. The specified font type must be supported by the page description language used by the printer (as taught by Salgado above) and the print data must be rendered by the spooler at the server in order to be printed.

8. Regarding **Claims 3 and 18**, Salgado and Tai teach the method of Claim 1 but fail to expressly disclose storing the rendered documents in the selected storage area. Salgado, however, teaches storing the converted font package for future use, so that the original font package will not have to be reconverted (see Fig.2 (122) and paragraph [0017]). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to store the rendered documents in the selected storage area for future use. The motivation would for printing efficiency purposes. Storing the rendered documents in the selected storage area would enable the documents to be reused without having to reconvert the specified font data.

9. Regarding **Claims 4 and 19**, Salgado further teaches that the management request received via simple mail network protocol (see Fig.1 (14) and paragraphs [0013-0014]).

10. Regarding **Claims 5 and 20**, Salgado and Tail teach the method of Claim 1 but fail to expressly disclose the image generating device is selected from a group consisting of a facsimile device and a copying device. Salgado, however, teaches that a computer, print server or printer could perform the font processing procedures for the specified font data (see Fig.1 (10,12,16) and paragraph [0011]). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include to the group of selection a facsimile machine and a copying device, as they are image- forming devices. The motivation would be to give the user multiple image-forming devices to select from for

Art Unit: 2625

image data communication, depending on the user's need and preferences. It is known in the art that multifunction peripheral devices include a copying device, a facsimile device and a print device, from which a user can select.

11. Claims 13-15 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salgado et al. (US Pub. 2003/0038958 A1) and Tai (US Patent 5,606,649), and in further view of McQueen, III et al. (US Patent 5,586,242).

12. Regarding **Claims 13 and 28**, Salgado discloses a method to manage multiple format fonts in an image generating device (see Fig.2 and paragraph [0006]), comprising the steps of: receiving a management request from an associated user to store a font in a selected storage area of the image generating device (see Fig.2 (110,114,122), paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0017]); receiving font data corresponding to a received management request (see Fig.2 (110,114,122) and paragraph [0011]); determining, from the received font data, the type of font to be stored (see Fig.2 (110,114,122), paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0016]); selectively generating a new font file (see Fig.2 (110,114,122) and paragraphs [0016-0017]); and storing the generated font file in an associated data storage for rendering of associated electronic document data (see Fig.2 (122), paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0017]). Salgado fails to expressly disclose selectively generating the font file such that when the font to be stored is of specific font, pre-appending a selected language code to the specific font data to create a new font file inclusive of a language code portion and a font data portion containing the received font data in its native form; converting font data into a suitable format for processing; receiving a document imaging request corresponding to an electronic document stored in the spooler; testing the font specification data in accordance with the font file stored in the associated data storage;

and commencing the rendering operation of the electronic documents data in the spooler in conjunction with the retrieve font data file. Salgado further fails to disclose a step for receiving a management request from an associated user to remove a selected font from a storage area, creating a new file that includes a selected command and the font to be removed, and upon determination that the selected font is stored in the storage area, removing the selected font from the storage area; and generating a list of fonts corresponding to the selected type of font; and transmitting the list of fonts to the associated user. via the display means and generating test documents listing the fonts.

13. Salgado, however, teaches that printers are designed to process certain font types or formats, depending on the page description language used by the printer (see paragraph [0004] and paragraph [0011]). Salgado further teaches obtaining information relating to the font type supported by a specific printer (see paragraph [0004] and paragraph [0014]), and storing the font code on a computer, server or at the printer (see Fig.1 (12) and paragraph [0011]). Salgado also teaches using the computer or print server to determine whether a specific printer accepts a certain font type and then converts the fonts for printing (see Fig.2 (112), paragraph [0012] and paragraph [0015]). Tai teaches a document encoding method for printing, wherein a PCL, ESCP or PostScript page description language is included with a font file for encoding font-related information to a document to be printed (see Col.5, Line 7-17 and Col.5, Line 36-41). McQueen discloses receiving a management request from an associated user to remove a selected font from a storage area (see Fig.7 (130) and Col.9, Line 1-14); creating a new file that includes a selected command and the font to be removed (see Col.9, Line 1-14); and removing the selected font from the storage area (see Fig.7 (138) and Col.9, Line 15-23). McQueen further teaches that

storing too many fonts and de-installing could be time-consuming (see Col.9, line 45-55).

McQueen also discloses generating a list of fonts corresponding to the selected type of font (see Fig.9, Col.4, Line 57-60 and Col.9, Line 1-27); and transmitting the list of fonts to the associated user via the display means (see Fig.9 and Col.4, Line 57-60); and generating test documents listing the fonts (see Fig.9 and Col.10, Line 40-65).

14. Salgado, Tai and McQueen are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely font processing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include to Salgado's method the step of pre-appending a selected language code to the specific font data to create a new font file inclusive of a language code portion and a font data portion containing the received font data in its native form; and converting font data into a suitable format for processing. The motivation would be to ensure that the specified font data will be processed at a printer that supports a specific page description language. The appended page description code would enable for the specified font file to be stored at a location, and later be sent and processed at different printers that are supported by different page description languages. With this method, the original font files could be reused for printing at different printing locations that are supported by various page description languages. It is also obvious that the print server and the print driver would test the specified font information in accordance with the font file stored, and commence the rendering operation of the electronic documents data in the spooler in conjunction with the retrieve font data file. Without testing the specified font data and rendering the electronic documents data in the spooler in conjunction with the retrieve font data file, the print data cannot be processed and printed. The specified font type must be supported by the page description language used by the printer (as

taught by Salgado above) and the print data must be rendered by the spooler at the server in order to be printed.

15. It is further obvious to include to the steps of receiving a management request from an associated user to remove a selected font from a storage area; creating a new file at includes a selected command and the font to be removed; and upon determination that the selected font is stored in the storage area, removing the selected font from the storage area. The motivation would be to remove excess fonts that are not needed and to avoid the time-consuming process of de-installing the fonts. Creating the file with the fonts to be removed would allow a user to avoid the process of de-installing the fonts. It is also obvious to include the steps of generating a list of fonts to the associated user by display means; and generating test documents listing the fonts. The motivation would be to provide a user interface for creating and displaying the font lists. The user interface would allow for the selected font description data to be viewed on the display and then be used on the intended documents.

16. Regarding **Claims 14 and 29**, Salgado further teaches that the management request received via simple mail network protocol (see Fig.1 (14) and paragraphs [0013-0014]).

17. Regarding **Claims 15 and 30**, Salgado and Tail teach the method of Claim 1 but fail to expressly disclose the image generating device is selected from a group consisting of a facsimile device and a copying device. Salgado, however, teaches that a computer, print server or printer could perform the font processing procedures for the specified font data (see Fig.1 (10,12,16) and paragraph [0011]). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include to the group of selection a facsimile machine and a copying device, as they are image- forming devices. The motivation would be to give the user multiple image-forming devices to select from for

image data communication, depending on the user's need and preferences. It is known in the art that multifunction peripheral devices include a copying device, a facsimile device and a print device, from which a user can select.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vu B. Hang whose telephone number is (571)272-0582. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00am - 6:00pm.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vu B. Hang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Mark K Zimmerman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625